

COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

July 19, 2005

4:30 PM

Chairman Thibault called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Thibault, Roy, Gatsas, Osborne, Porter

Messrs.: T. Arnold, S. Tellier,

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Russel Johnson, PSNH, seeking authorization to place a padmount transformer and cement slab (8' x 8') and situated approximately 5 feet from the back of the Visitors Center at Veterans Park.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is my understanding that PSNH has requested that this item be tabled. They are trying to work something out with Intown and a few other people to maybe do underground.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Porter it was voted to table this item.

TABLED ITEMS

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to remove Item 4 from the table.

Land between Valley and Grove Streets previously owned by B&M Railroad.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated this was tabled pending a standard policy to be brought forward and I believe the Solicitor could address that if you wish.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated as you probably recall, the last time we brought the policy before the Committee, the Committee asked that we develop a procedure for applying for the use of the right-of-way and come up with a fee charge for using the right-of-way. We have done that in the policy that I submitted with my letter dated July 6. In a nutshell it sets forth a procedure whereby a proposed

applicant would submit an application to this Committee. That application would have to include a plan with certain items on it, a survey plan showing the right-of-way and what portion of the right-of-way they wished to use. It would require that they specify how they want to use the right-of-way. That application would then be sent to the Planning Department and Parks & Recreation for a recommendation and upon the return of those recommendations, whatever they might be, it could be take up by the Committee. As for the fee that was requested, what is I guess proposed is that they pay a yearly fee equal to the real estate taxes that they would pay if they owned the land.

Chairman Thibault asked how would you assess that.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered what would happen under this proposed plan is that the Assessors would calculate what the fee would be and the City Clerk would collect it on a yearly basis. It also provides that if the fee is not paid that their revocable license lapses with the practical effect of having to apply again for the right-of-way.

Alderman Osborne asked what type of stipulations do you have along with this.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I am not sure what you mean, Alderman.

Alderman Osborne asked well what they can do and what they can't do on that piece of property.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I think that the policy as to how the right-of-way is to be used was set forth in the prior policy that we submitted to this Committee. It has not changed. Basically I think the policy is that the City discourages private use of the railroad right-of-way given that the plans are some time in the future to have a pedestrian or bike path using that right-of-way. Beyond that the policy is that except in extraordinary circumstances they will only get a revocable license, which the City could revoke at its sole discretion.

Alderman Porter asked, Steve, are these on separate maps and lots or is it all one lot billed to Gilford Transportation and how would you delineate each section. It has been done before that properties...basically they would carry an assessed value in essence and then multiply by the tax rate to arrive at whatever the fee is. I think in order to know exactly what it is that they are being billed for...

Steve Tellier, Chairman, Board of Assessors responded that is exactly so, Alderman. What we would have to do is just calculate the area directly abutting the property that is applying for the revocable license, figure out what the square foot assessment is for their property, apply it to that small portion of the railroad

area which would determine what the taxes would be calculated on and that would be the cost of the license.

Alderman Porter asked but you wouldn't necessarily give a map and lot number then.

Mr. Tellier answered no we wouldn't carve out a special spot. We would just identify in writing what that amount of land is that is pertained to the revocable license.

Alderman Porter asked what would be the term. Would it be in perpetuity, renewable or...

Deputy Solicitor Arnold interjected that, of course, could vary. As envisioned I guess it would be in perpetuity but keeping in mind that it is a revocable license, meaning the City could revoke it at any time. Just to go back a little, one of the reasons that the staff thought that a survey plan would be handy is precisely so that they would have to delineate the area of the right-of-way that they wanted to use in part for calculation of the fee.

Alderman Roy stated I don't know if David from Planning wants to take this question or the City Solicitor but in our City of Manchester policy regarding the private sector use of the former railroad line, how do we circumvent items 1 and 2 that the rail line shall be used or managed for recreational trail for use by the general public and any future alterations by the City of Manchester shall be reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded number one is the main reason why we thought that a revocable license would be the appropriate format because at some time in the future when this is as planned turned into a walking or biking pathway the City could revoke the licenses or modify them appropriately to take care of the proposed use. As for Item 2, the use agreement that we have with the state provides that if we dispose of the property we need their review and approval, which is what we went through with the easement request for 543 Douglas Street. We felt that again a revocable license would not necessitate state approval. Any conveyance of the property, easement or otherwise, would.

Alderman Osborne asked, Steve, how many would you think on this railroad bed...how many lots would you say there were roughly.

Mr. Tellier answered I would say there are...the lots that are available. Probably hundreds, however, how many may come for it I can't say.

Alderman Osborne responded well this is what I am trying to get at. Some people want it for business reasons – they need it for parking or so on but I know some people too who would do it just to beautify it and make it look better, which I look for. Also by taxing them on property that they don't own, is this a legal way of doing it?

Mr. Tellier replied we are not taxing them. I just want to be clear because we had this discussion with the City Solicitor. We are using the assessment as a fee process. That is what it is. It is a fee. We are not taxing it.

Alderman Osborne asked would they call that circumventing the whole situation.

Mr. Tellier answered I think in this case they are looking for a method to utilize the land and this was the best method currently that the City Solicitor's Office, Planning and a few others have thought of to bring forward as a mechanism to make this work. Obviously there are pros and cons. To facilitate this is going to take some time from City departments that are already bursting at the seams. Nobody is getting any additional help. There are instances where taxpayers have come forward to the Aldermen and expressed a sincere desire to either beautify the property and keep it clean of debris, waste, glass, demolition materials and others who really want to keep their business going strong and pay taxes and could use the extra parking and are willing to pay a reasonable fee for that use. So there are pros and cons to both sides.

Alderman Osborne replied I know. Also, the state. What do they think about the City making money off of this particular project?

Mr. Tellier responded I have no comment on that.

Alderman Osborne asked you never checked with them at all.

Mr. Tellier answered I did not. We worked with the process for working towards the fee process and in working with identifying these parcels. That was the crux of our involvement in this process.

Alderman Osborne asked Mr. Arnold do you know anything as far as the state.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered we did not check with the state. We didn't think it was a concern.

Alderman Osborne asked you don't think it is a concern. Well I would hate to do it and have it become a concern. It would be nice to check with them wouldn't it?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered it is City owned land, Alderman, that has a restriction on it. It is City owned land.

Alderman Osborne asked what exactly is that restriction.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered that if the City were to convey or dispose of the property we would need state approval to do so.

Alderman Osborne asked and by renting the property it doesn't matter.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded under this policy we are granting a revocable license. I don't view that as conveying or disposing of the property because we can revoke it at any time.

Alderman Osborne stated some of this is in my ward. I see where they have done a good job. I don't go for too much the fence idea but I think beautifying like they did up there on Belmont Street near the two apartment buildings it looks a lot better and it keeps a lot of the junk cars that used to be sitting there away. I think if we charge a lot of them money for it some are going to do it because of business reasons but for beautification I don't think they are going to break their neck if they have to pay taxes on it. This is what I am getting at. I am opposed to this concept. That is my two cents.

Chairman Thibault stated I think what we are looking for here is a motion as to how we are going to handle this process from now on.

Alderman Roy stated I have two quick questions for the Solicitor. The funds that are raised from this license in lieu of taxes, where would they go to?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I would assume they would go into the general fund.

Alderman Roy stated I have a question for either Jane or Paul. This proposed policy has a section that states any train operations or activities will be strictly limited to the removal of steel rails, wooden ballasts, installation of recreational trails. How would that solve the problem along Valley Street where access over the rail lines is being looked for? It is fairly limiting on beautification in our policy. I don't see how that helps the business gain access to that lot.

Jane Hills responded in terms of PMC Corporation who I have been working with for 14 months now and they would like to put in a truck access off of Valley Street if granted the license to do this. It does say the way this is written "in any exceptional cases" it is limited to this and perhaps business expansion and helping

a business perhaps grow and add more employees would be an exceptional case. This business has certainly from the beginning expressed an interest in working with the City and the Parks Department to make sure that anything they do does not affect long-term the ability of the City to put in those trails.

Chairman Thibault stated I think this does not interfere with all of the other people that would like to encroach on their properties across the street, if you will, from that. I think this is a very unique situation. These people are only asking to cross the railroad bed with a trailer truck as compared to some of the others who are looking to beautify the areas or use them for parking or whatever. I think it is a separate question all together that we are going to take up on Item 7.

Ms. Hills responded they are intending to beautify that area as well.

Chairman Thibault replied that is fine but I think it is different.

Alderman Roy stated with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, if we set a policy for individual landowners along the rail line we could literally, as Steve said, be sitting here with 100 agenda items with each individual landowner asking the same question. What I am looking for is with the ones that are in front of us today can we set a policy that works for residential usage, commercial rental usages or just crossing. That is where some of the language in this stops commercial and other language in this helps the residential or hurts it. My question being is this so time sensitive that it can't be revised a little bit looking at the entire rail line instead of four or five specific properties. I want to help out the residential, which has done a great job beautifying, but I don't want to set a policy that works on Belmont and Grove Streets but doesn't work on South Willow or Valley Street and Maple. Do you understand that?

Chairman Thibault responded I appreciate that, however, these people have been playing with this thing for 18 months just to be able to cross the railroad. I don't believe at that point that they are going to impede the railroad in any way other than occasionally they will have to cross it. That is my only problem whereas the other ones want to use it for parking or beautifying it. I think that is a whole different question in my opinion. You are right thought. When we make a policy let's make it to handle all of these things. Why couldn't we pass this...

Alderman Gatsas interjected it is not on the table right now. That is why we can't pass it.

Chairman Thibault stated I am just saying that we shouldn't be talking about it because it is Item 7. The point is why couldn't we pass it when we get to it with the stipulation that we meet all of the requirements at that point when we do it.

These people have been waiting for a long time and I feel that we are holding up a business here in the City that employs how many people Jane?

Ms. Hills answered 90.

Alderman Gatsas asked can we have this discussion when we get to that item.

Chairman Thibault responded I would be glad to. That is why I was trying to say that this is a different question. Let's stay with Item 4.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated just to clarify you are on Item 4 because that is the item that was removed from the table. We have a policy that has been presented to the Committee because it relates to that item as well as others on the table. The suggestion from the Clerk would be to deal first with the policy issue as to whether or not you want to recommend that be adopted or send it back to staff to be revised.

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. Tellier I noticed on the three parcels that we have before us you allocated the same square footage price of \$4 for each one. Obviously what you are saying is that you are making it consistent with what B&M is asking for property, but I would assume with all of the square footage on Willow Street or South Willow Street it would not be the same cost as something that is up on Massabesic.

Mr. Tellier answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why you used...

Mr. Tellier interjected these were earlier considerations. I think in the future consistent with the policy that is being discussed tonight what we have discussed is to look at what the current property is. If it is a residential property that per square foot cost is most likely a lot lower than the cost of a per square foot business. We would figure out what that small corridor of land is, how many linear or square feet are proposed, what is the square footage of the abutting property that is asking for the revocable license and apply that to that corridor area and that would be the fee. I think the values that are sitting before you as indicated you guys have been talking about this for 18 months and this is was if it was sold. They were willing to buy it, lease it, rent it and now we are in discussions for a revocable lease and the policy or the structure that we have discussed to date, the latest idea is to apply their present assessment to the corridor area and use that for the fee structure. That would mitigate a different fee for every piece of property depending on the linear feet of the abutting property that was asking for the revocable license and the type of property.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the consistency that you had of \$4/square foot on these three reports...

Mr. Tellier interjected would likely not hold true. That is correct unless it was the purview of the Committee to use that \$4 fee consistently because that is the sales price that they have reasonably consistently used to sell small parcels that they have sold. It has been about \$4/foot whether it is to a business or a residential property. That is the square foot cost they have used consistently.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the precedent of two abutters, one coming to you for that rail use...what happens to the other one or do you use a 15'...if there is a 30' strip do you give them 15' or do you give them 30' or how does that work.

Mr. Tellier answered well the corridor is reasonably consistent as far as its width. We would look at the frontage they are asking for.

Alderman Gatsas responded you are missing my point. The corridor is 30'. There is an abutter on one side of the 30' piece and there is an abutter on the other side of the 30' piece.

Mr. Tellier replied we would split it down the middle in that case if they were both asking.

Alderman Gatsas asked if just one was asking would you give one abutter the 30'.

Mr. Tellier answered that is a question that hasn't come up. I guess we would ask them what they are asking for in the license. Are they asking for half or are they asking for the full corridor?

Alderman Gatsas replied if they are asking for the full corridor don't you think it would be...I guess this is a question for the City Solicitor. Would we then have to offer the 15' to the other abutter?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I don't think you would have to. You might choose to do so but again keep in mind that this is a revocable license so I presume you could grant 30' and if the opposite abutter comes along and wants to use a portion of it you could revoke the license and modify it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess there should be some consistency because you could find 10 abutters in a row and one takes the 30' and the next one takes 15' and you are going to find jagged fencing going along the corridor.

Mr. Tellier stated I think in the discussions that I have heard there has been a reasonable amount of reluctance to allow any fencing to occur with the exception of privacy fencing. Let's use the one on Valley Street for example. They are asking for parking and it abuts a residential home on that backside. There was an initial discussion that there could be a request by the abutter to add a section of fencing just to keep the headlights out of the residential home as a courtesy. As far as fencing for any other reason, to prohibit access, I think there was a reluctance to provide that ability.

Alderman Osborne asked how many feet are we talking on that railroad bed. 25'?

Mr. Tellier answered it is about 40'. Anywhere from 25' at the narrowest areas but generally you could state that they are about 40' wide.

Alderman Osborne asked isn't this a can of worms in a way to have one abutter on one side and one on the other and this one wants to do this and the other side wants to do that. We can't police this whole railroad bed.

Mr. Tellier answered I am going to be very frank. There is going to be a benefit to certain property owners. There is one business that needs a little more parking because on street parking is restricted. I will be very frank. There might be a host of difficulties that come up along the way and they will have to be discussed and ironed out.

Alderman Osborne asked don't you think it would be nice to let the private sector take its course on something like this. I mean license it for \$1 and not get tied up with all of the appraising. How rich are we going to get on this property here? What are we talking?

Mr. Tellier responded I am not here to answer a policy issue that hasn't been determined by the Board. We tried to answer as many questions as we thought of and the City Solicitor and others have spent a lot of time trying to create a mechanism that seems to be fair, reasonable and mechanically sound that protects the City as well to try to help the taxpayers who have professed an interest but there will be some difficulties down the road.

Alderman Osborne stated I think what we have here is a large can of worms. We have been on this for quite awhile now and we are going nowhere as far as I am concerned. I think it is going to end up to be nothing but a lot of problems. I think it belongs to the City and if someone wants to beautify it, that is a good idea and I have no problem with that. To try to make a business out of it and start charging them money and then have to take it back six months down the road because we

want to put a bike trail through it all this kind of stuff it gets to be a job in itself. I am still opposed to it unless it is \$1 and let nature take its course.

Alderman Roy stated I agree somewhat with my colleague from Ward 5 but we are not looking at something that is going to be six months down the road. We don't have the money to bond this. We don't have the money to pay for it and just looking at some of the rough numbers, Item 7, which is outside of what we are talking about would add roughly \$9,280 to their tax base. So I think this is a definite benefit to some of the taxpayers in our City that would see a reduction just letting people use land and beautify land if they want to at their choice. I do believe, as Alderman Gatsas alluded to, that we need a policy to protect future abutters that if there are two abutters that we draw a line down the middle and it is fair for everyone for the length of time that we give this license. I think this policy needs work but I do think it could be a very good financial benefit to the taxpayers.

Chairman Thibault asked what would you like to do at this point. Would you like to table it pending more information?

Alderman Roy moved to send the policy back to staff for some revisions in the areas of cost and fairness and some fiscal impact on departments that would have to manage it to make sure it is worth our while.

Alderman Porter duly seconded the motion. Chairman Thibault called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I would like to take a minute so I understand what you want staff to do. When you say look at costs and fairness you are talking about the cost of the license for differing uses?

Alderman Roy responded I think it would help this Committee greatly if the Assessors took possibly five or ten test subjects and showed what the license fee would be and establish some language as to fairness between abutters if it is owned by two or three property abutters. With our GIS system we can walk right along that property line from the computer screen and see if you can get that done just to show where the centerline is. As far as language, I guess that would fall to your department. Could that be done for our next Lands and Buildings meeting in order to assist the residential and commercial property owners?

Mr. Tellier replied yes.

Chairman Thibault stated before we go any further I would like to make a comment. At the last L&B meeting we had a problem with an abutter on Douglas

Street and I just want to publicly thank Alderman Gatsas for getting involved and getting the permits needed to get this done. I had been playing with that for four to five months and believe me it was a quagmire of problems that I have never encountered. I just want to thank him in public for that.

Alderman Gatsas responded you're welcome.

5. Land at Belmont/Valley/Grove Streets formerly owned by B&M Railroad.
(Tabled 07/27/2004 pending standard policy for purchasing railroad land to be submitted by Planning.)
Board of Assessors – value range \$26,484
Planning – recommend license for usage subject to conditions
Tax Collector – no interest, not tax-deeded parcel

This item remained on the table.

6. Land at Maple/Somerville Streets formerly owned by B&M Railroad.
(Tabled 07/27/2004 pending standard policy for purchasing railroad land to be submitted by Planning.)
Board of Assessors – value range \$21,084
Planning/Parks – do not dispose, recommend license for usage subject to condition

This item remained on the table.

7. Communication from Greg Grace, Vice President of PMC Wire requesting access to their plant from Valley Street, which would require crossing the former Portsmouth Branch rail corridor.
(Tabled 05/02/2005 pending standard policy for purchasing railroad land to be submitted by Planning.)

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we have an item of new business. It is a communication from Gerald Hebert. The City has a parcel of land known as Tax Map 246, Lots 3, 6 and 7. It is property on Page Street and it has been formerly called Page Michigan. The Tax Collector, Solicitor, Clerk's Office, Assessor and Planning Department have all spoken regarding this parcel. It has been out to auction at least two times. It has substantial wetlands on it and the City has recently received an offer to purchase the property by the abutter. At the auction everything fell through because you can't build on the property basically. There is

too much wetland on it. Mr. Tellier is here to address the property itself and the Tax Collector is here if you have any questions for her regarding the matter. We have included reports from all of the related departments. There is a discrepancy between the offer and as I understand it the last value that was placed on the property was \$7,500 to \$10,000 and the Assessors have reviewed the matter and if you want maybe Steve can review the matter.

Mr. Tellier stated the Assessors handed out two documents. One is a color map, a GIS color map that shows the extensive amount of wetlands. When the initial process to send this out to bid was done, the site was reviewed and it was pretty dry. It was late in the year. The amount of wetland was not evidenced. There was an effort to buy it at around \$50,000 to \$60,000. Subsequently it was found to be extremely wet and they backed out. We looked at it again and after getting the reports from the state as far as the extent of the wetland we revised the residual...it's only utility would be to be used as additional residual land, meaning setbacks and total square area footage if somebody wanted to expand their site or if the abutter wanted to build more. That was the utility that we envisioned its highest and best use to be. So we have revised the value to be \$7,500 to \$10,000. My understanding from the City Clerk is that there is an offer. It has been auctioned at least twice. It has never been sold. We have one offer. My understanding is that the offer on the table is for \$5,000. My understanding as well is that the City Clerk has spoken with that individual today. Steve Hamilton from my office spoke with the person who made the offer yesterday and we reiterated how we came up with our value. We are not going to go willie nillie on changing our values. We feel that the value of \$7,500 to \$10,000 was not unreasonable. However, if the only offer we have is \$5,000 it is not unreasonable that under the purview of this Committee showing preference to the abutters that that be taken into consideration. However, I would certainly bring it to the attention that if we are going to dispose of this lot it should be all three lots, which is Lots 3, 6 and 7 in its entirety. Not just the front lot, but all three. That puts it back on the tax rolls and takes the City off the hook for liability. The color map was given to you to show you the extensive amount of wetland. It doesn't show the topography but there is significant steepness, a large hole, on that site.

Alderman Porter stated I am a little confused. On the second page it says, "previous value of \$60,000 would be appropriate."

Mr. Tellier responded this was a year before.

Alderman Porter asked so this is the one that failed.

Mr. Tellier answered that is correct. I gave this to you just to show you the history. This was a previous year when we were not aware of the amount of wetlands.

Alderman Porter moved to sell the property to the abutter for \$5,000.

Alderman Osborne asked is this land off of Page Street buildable at all by itself.

Mr. Tellier answered absolutely not.

Alderman Osborne asked why would someone offer \$5,000 for it if they can't build on it.

Mr. Tellier answered it is the abutter to the right and he owns that small vacant lot in between his house on that. If you wanted to add on to the house...

Alderman Osborne interjected I understand all of that. So this is not buildable to somebody?

Mr. Tellier responded absolutely not. That is correct. There is a walk in of maybe 15' before it goes downhill into the rushes.

Alderman Gatsas asked just for clarification the red is the lot that we sold for \$60,000.

Mr. Tellier answered no. The GIS requires us...what we are identifying is one lot. I am not advanced enough...with this GIS software I can't outline all three. The two smaller lots behind it are included in this land purchase and that is what I am telling the Committee. We should make it mandatory that all three lots go for this purchase price.

Alderman Gatsas asked so you are saying Lot 246-7, 246-6...is that what you are talking about.

Mr. Tellier answered that is correct. Map 246, Lots 3, 6 and 7 in their entirety.

Alderman Gatsas asked who owns Lot 246-2 and 246-2A.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated maybe I can help.

Mr. Tellier responded I think it is Mr. Hebert on the right but I don't have that in front of me.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied you do. In the handout that the Clerk provided there is a picture of the house. The one with Page Street and you can see a white house. That is the gentleman that is requesting the purchase so there is the lot next to the house on the right. He also owns that. The larger parcel to the right of that and the two behind it are the three City lots.

Alderman Gatsas asked so he owns the two lots that are behind him are 7,500 square feet each behind the white house.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered behind the house I am not sure who owns that.

Alderman Gatsas stated well he has to be because he is encroaching that lot line according to what I am looking at on the next page that you gave me.

Mr. Tellier stated I would suspect so.

Alderman Gatsas asked so he would own roughly in there somewhere around 60,000 square feet. What is the zoning there?

Mr. Tellier answered I don't have that on this map. I think it is R-1. It is residential.

Alderman Gatsas responded are you sure.

Mr. Tellier replied I can't confirm that.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I know if he is going to build a house the lot next to his has 50' of frontage. I think his intent was to build a small house but he cannot put it on the 50'. He needs 25' more of frontage in order to meet the requirement.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess my question is with the additional 20,000 square feet what kind of a planned unit development could you put in there.

Mr. Tellier responded with the amount of wetland that you have there...do you mean if he takes down the house. I don't know.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess that is my question. What does that additional 20,000 square feet add to the value of the property if you go in with a planned unit development? It has to be a drastic change from 40,000 to 60,000 square feet.

Mr. Tellier replied it is but we have offered those three parcels on the market at \$60,000. We had a taker and then we found out it wasn't worth that. Then we offered it from \$7,500 to \$10,000. We had no takers at that. Now we have an offer by the abutter who is willing to go \$5,000 or a little more – I don't know. Here we have an opportunity to get it on the tax rolls. It has been mentioned by this Committee that the goal is to get as much City land on the tax rolls as possible. This is the one opportunity that we are looking at right now.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't know if it is a street. Is it a paper street or an alleyway?

Mr. Tellier responded that is a paper street.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated which the abutter on the other side is also parking on as I understand it.

Alderman Gatsas asked why wouldn't we find out if the abutter on the other side wants it and discontinue the street.

Mr. Tellier answered we asked. The abutter on the other side actually converted that four tenement building to condos and an effort was made to reach that individual and they have no interest because they own the lot behind them so they have plenty of parking for their condominium association.

Alderman Gatsas asked are you sure this is R-1B.

Mr. Tellier answered no I am not. I said that at the outset. I am not sure. I know it is not commercial. That is all I can say. However, that is why I brought this color map to denote the extensive amount of wetlands on the subject property. You are right. With consolidation would it add a great deal of value to an abutting lot if they owned a large plot of land? Quite possibly yes but if the land changed in use from a single-family to a planned unit development then the City would in kind change its per square foot value and its value on the tax rolls would change as well if a legal change to that property ensued.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would like to know what it is zoned before we do anything.

Chairman Thibault asked, Steve, I think it begs to the question Alderman Osborne asked. Would this at this point make this a buildable lot?

Mr. Tellier answered no because what would have to occur is the abutter...now I am an Assessor and not a Planner but my understanding would be that a lot line

adjustment would have to be made or a consolidation would have to be made with the other vacant parcel to give him enough frontage and then he would have to provide a site plan to show the building envelope that would still conform to keeping him away from wetlands and give him his setbacks and side to side requirements. I think that is why his investment is tempered with the fact that he is looking at some measure of speculation but he is willing to take that chance.

Alderman Osborne asked what is this separate here right in between here. You said this was a paper street?

Mr. Tellier stated you are looking at Page Street. In between is a short corridor and that is a paper street.

Alderman Osborne asked what is this other separation here.

Mr. Tellier answered that is another paper street behind there. That wide corridor. As I stated before there was an effort made to contact that building owner to see if they wanted it and also to see if they were interested in this parcel because they own the parcel behind in case they might want to build additional apartments or whatever and they showed no interest in the property. The present offer that we have is the only offer on the table.

Alderman Osborne asked how much would this give the City if we did what you are asking. If we sold it for \$8,000 or whatever it is.

Mr. Tellier answered if he finds out that he can consolidate this with another property and have a house lot there by the time 2006 you might see a market value of \$70,000 to \$90,000 on a house lot.

Alderman Osborne asked so he is the only one that can put a house there is what you are saying.

Mr. Tellier answered he is the only one that has the ability. That is correct.

Alderman Osborne asked without the house how much are we talking.

Mr. Tellier answered it is residual land. It is peanuts.

Alderman Osborne asked what would you like to do with it. Would you like to get some more information?

Alderman Gatsas stated I would like to know what it is zoned.

Mr. Tellier stated I can walk to my office and tell you what the map would show.

Chairman Thibault responded we don't have time for that. We should probably table it for further information.

Alderman Porter moved to table. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. Chairman Thibault called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Tellier asked is that the only piece of information that the Committee needs.

Alderman Roy asked if you can also bring back to us what would be allowed for usage on 70,000 square feet of land in that area.

Mr. Tellier answered that would have to be directed to the Planning or Building Department as the authority. I really can't speak to that.

Chairman Thibault asked can you coordinate that and get that information for us.

Alderman Porter stated I have a suggestion. When you present a map like this to us there is really not much from a standpoint of a point of reference as to what these paper streets are and perhaps you could make a pencil...I don't need something in color. Maybe everybody else does but if you make copies that would suffice for myself and just kind of put in what it is, the street and if it is discontinued or a paper street. That might be helpful.

Mr. Tellier responded so we will get the zoning and what might be allowed in that square footage that you guys determined.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee